

Keronen discloses a system in which an Internet pen 10 can access a desired resource on a network system, and the resource is output on display access terminal 11. (Figs. 1 and 3). Internet pen 10 and display access terminal 11 communicate using infra-red light. (Col. 4, lines 21-31). However, Keronen does not disclose that Internet pen 10 includes a display.

To reject the display means recited in Applicant's claim 6, the Office Action cites column 65, lines 57-65 of Keronen. It is noted that Keronen does not contain a column 65. Nevertheless, column 5, lines 57-65 and column 6, lines 57-65 do not disclose that Internet pen 10 includes a display. Because Keronen does not disclose a remote controller device that includes "display means for displaying information sent from said main device" and as recited in Applicant's claim 6, Keronen cannot anticipate Applicant's claim 6.

It is noted that the rejection of Applicant's claim 6 does not specifically identify the particular elements of Keronen that correspond to the main device and the remote device recited in Applicant's claims. Accordingly, if this grounds of rejection is maintained, or if Keronen is relied upon for any purpose in any future Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests that such future Office Action specifically identify the elements in Keronen that correspond to the main device and the remote device recited in the claims.

Claims 4, 5, 14, 15 and 18-20 variously depend from Applicant's claim 6, and are, therefore, not anticipated by Keronen for at least those reasons stated above with regard to Applicant's claim 6.

For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of Applicant's claims 4-6, 14, 15, and 18-20 as being anticipated by Keronen be withdrawn.

In the eighth paragraph of the Office Action, claims 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. Re. 36,988 to Johnson et al. ("Johnson"). This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

Johnson does not anticipate Applicant's claim 22 because Johnson does not disclose all of the elements of Applicant's claim 22. For example, Johnson does not disclose "providing the requested information to the portable remote controller device" as recited in Applicant's claim 22.

Johnson discloses a method for authorizing access to particular television channels. To reject Applicant's claim 22, the Office Action only relies upon column 15, lines 50-65 of Johnson. The cited section of Johnson discloses a customer tuning to a specific channel, entering a password, and enabling or disabling desired premium channels. However, the section of Johnson cited by the Office Action does not disclose "providing the requested information to the portable remote controller device" as recited in Applicant's claim 22. Accordingly, Johnson cannot anticipate Applicant's claim 22.

It is noted that the Office Action has not identified the elements of Johnson that correspond to the main device, portable remote controller device and display device of Applicant's claim 22. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that if Johnson is relied upon in any manner in any future Office

Action, that an identification of the elements of Johnson that correspond to the main device, portable remote controller device and display device recited in Applicant's claims be provided so that Applicant's have a full and fair opportunity to evaluate how Johnson is being applied to reject Applicant's claims.

Claim 23 depends from claim 22, and hence, is not anticipated by Johnson for at least those reasons stated above with regard to claim 22.

For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 22 and 23 as being anticipated by Johnson be withdrawn.

In the ninth paragraph of the Office Action claims 2, 3, 7-13, 16 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,882,299 to Allport ("Allport") in view of Johnson. This ground of rejection is respectfully traversed.

The combination of Allport and Johnson does not render Applicant's claim 2 obvious because the combination does not disclose or suggest all of the elements of Applicant's claim 2. For example, the combination of Allport and Johnson does not disclose or suggest an "access destination storage means for storing the identification code of said remote controller device in the access destination in a one-to-one correspondence" as recited in Applicant's claim 2.

Allport discloses a portable Internet-enabled controller that can control a television. The Office Action acknowledges that Allport does not disclose or suggest the access destination storage means recited in Applicant's claim 2.

To remedy the above-identified deficiency of Allport, the Office Action relies upon Johnson. Specifically, the Office Action relies upon column 15, lines 50-65 of Johnson as allegedly disclosing that there is a one-to-one correspondence between a password and a channel. Column 15, lines 50-65 of Johnson discloses that a customer tunes to a specific channel and enters a password, which then provides the ability to disable or enable all premium channels or particular premium channels (Figs. 12 (a) – 12 (g)). Accordingly, Johnson discloses a single password being associated with the ability to enable or disable all premium channels. In other words, Johnson discloses a one-to-many correspondence between the password and the premium channels. In contrast, Applicant's claim 2 recites that the access destination storage means stores "the identification code of said remote controller device and the access destination in a one-to-one correspondence." Because Allport and Johnson both do not disclose or suggest the access destination storage means recited in Applicant's claim 2, the combination of Allport and Johnson cannot render Applicant's claim too obvious.

Claims 3, 7-13, 16 and 17 variously depend from Applicant's claim 2, and accordingly, are patentably distinguishable over the combination of Allport and Johnson for at least those reasons stated above with regard to Applicant's claim 2.


For at least those reasons stated above, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2, 3, 7-13, 16 and 17 as being obvious in view of the combination of Allport and Johnson be withdrawn.

If there are any questions regarding this response or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

If necessary to effect a timely response, this paper should be considered as a petition for an Extension of Time sufficient to effect a timely response, and please charge any deficiency in fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 05-1323 (Docket # 038849.49341).

Respectfully submitted,

February 2, 2006



Jeffrey D. Sanok  
Registration No. 32,169  
Stephen W. Palan  
Registration No. 43,420

CROWELL & MORING, LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
P.O. Box 14300  
Washington, DC 20044-4300  
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500  
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844  
JDS:SWP